



RE: Survival with & without barred owls

Anthony, Robert G - FW <robert.anthony@oregonstate.edu>
Thu, Jul 8, 2010 at 9:48 AM
To: Nathan Schumaker < , "katie.dugger@orst.edu" <katie.dugger@orst.edu>
Cc: Bruce Marcot <brucem@spiritone.com>, Brian Woodbridge <Brian_Woodbridge@fws.gov>,
"Brendan_White@fws.gov" <Brendan_White@fws.gov>

Nathan:

My apologies for not responding sooner but Katie and I needed to discuss your email before one of us responded. Since Katie is out of town for the next few days, I will respond to your questions realizing that we may need to discuss the effect of barred owls on spotted owl survival in more detail in a face-to-face meeting. I am sure Katie will add to this message if I omit something important or mis-represent things.

First, it is important to note that the results that Katie sent you were from the meta-analysis of survival rates of adult (stage 3) owls for all of the study areas combined. About 90% of the territorial breeders are adults for all study areas comgined. Most of this data set was collected with a minor influence of barred owls from 1985 to 2003 but with increasing barred owl presence from 2003 to 2008 (see attached table); therefore, we think that the data I gave you under the "OLD" column represents survival rates of spotted owls with little influence from barred owls. Katie used the results from the meta-analysis that Gary White did to compute the estimates of survival or spotted owls in the absence of barred owls (0.8499) and in the presence of barred owls (0.7642), which is a 0.086 decline in survival of spotted owls in the presence of barred owls. This effect may not seem like a large effect, but the dynamics of spotted owl populations are most sensitive to changes in adults survival rates, so this effect will likely reveal some different results. So, all you have to do is subtract this effect of barred owls from the survival data that I gave you from the Forsman et al. manuscript. I have computed the survival rates of spotted owls in the presence of barred owls and added it to the table below, labeled them as "No barred owl" and "barred owl present", and outlined them in yellow. Those are the values you should use in the HexSIm modeling for survival rates of spotted owls when barred owls are absent versus present. Note that we are assuming that the effect of barred owls on spotted owl survival (0.086 decline))is the same across all age classes and resource levels as we do not have data to suggest otherwise.

Although the effect of barred owls on spotted owl survival from the meta-analysis represents a population level effect, you are applying it as an individual effect in the HexSIm modeling. In addition, you can use the data in the attached table to determine the probability that a spotted owl will encounter a barred owl in any province or study area by using the data for 2008 in the table (also outlined in yellow). Those data represent the proportion of spotted owl territories where barred owls were detected in 2008, the year for which the most recent data were summarized. These data represent an index to barred owl abundance on each of the study areas, and they can be used to represent the probability that spotted owls will encounter barred owls on each of the study areas (provinces.). Armed with these two data sets, I believe you have all of the data you need to simulate the effect of barred owls and spotted owl survival and stability of spotted owl populations.

Let us know if you have any questions about this.

Bob

From: Nathan Schumaker [mailto:

Sent: Tuesday, July 06, 2010 9:38 AM

To: katie.dugger@orst.edu; Anthony, Robert G - FW

Cc: Bruce Marcot; Brian Woodbridge

Subject: Survival with & without barred owls

Hi Katie & Bob,

With Bob's help, I've used the Forsman et. al. data to construct the following table for HexSim:

	NO Barred Owl	Barred Owl Present
Stage 0 ; Resource Low	0.366	0.280
Stage 0 ; Resource Med	0.499	0.413
Stage 0 ; Resource High	0.632	0.546
Stage 1 ; Resource Low	0.544	0.458
Stage 1 ; Resource Med	0.718	0.632
Stage 1 ; Resource High	0.795	0.709
Stage 2 ; Resource Low	0.676	0.590
Stage 2 ; Resource Med	0.811	0.725
Stage 2 ; Resource High	0.866	0.780
Stage 3 ; Resource Low	0.819	0.733
Stage 3 ; Resource Med	0.849	0.763
Stage 3 ; Resource High	0.865	0.779

We took the low and high estimates for survival, per stage class, and assigned them to my low and high resource classes. Then I assigned the mean survival rates (again, per stage class) to the medium resource class.

You've since put together survival estimates for NSOs in the absence of barred owls (0.849894) and in the presence of barred owls (0.764236). I've made the assumption that the Forsman et. al. survival data was collected in the presence of barred owls. So I multiplied those values by 0.849894 / 0.764236 = 1.112083 to get the NEW values below:

					OLD	NEW
Stage	0	;	Resource	Low	0.366	0.407
Stage	0	;	Resource	Med	0.499	0.555
Stage	0	;	Resource	High	0.632	0.703
Stage	1	;	Resource	Low	0.544	0.605
Stage	1	;	Resource	Med	0.718	0.798
Stage	1	;	Resource	High	0.795	0.884
Stage	2	;	Resource	Low	0.676	0.752
Stage	2	;	Resource	Med	0.811	0.902
Stage	2	;	Resource	High	0.866	0.963
Stage	3	;	Resource	Low	0.819	0.911
Stage	3	;	Resource	Med	0.849	0.944
Stage	3	;	Resource	High	0.865	0.962

The values in the NEW column are thus assumed to reflect survival rates if there were no barred owls present.

Does this make sense to you? Have I misinterpreted or misused those survival data you sent? I'd appreciate any thoughts you have!

Thanks,

1993 0 130 0 130 0 122 0 090 0 072 0 088 0 019 0 019 0 000 0 109 1994 0 109 0 019 0 019 0 019 0 019 0 019 0 019 1994 0 109 0 109 1995 0	0 000 0 000 0 000 0 007
2007 0 181 0 320 0 526 0 650 0 635 0 619 0 200 0 258 0 128 0 327	0 021 0 029 0 033 0 017 0 000 0 015 0 056 0 059 0 042 0 073 0 085
	0 171 0 227 0 185 0 205